REVIEW FOR APPLICABILITY OF/COMPLIANCE WITH ORDINANCES/POLICIES

FOR PURPOSES OF CONSIDERATION OF

TM5560/GPA09-005/REZ09-001; ER LOG NO.: 04-09-011A, McDonald Major Subdivision for 15 lots

January 8, 2010

<u>I. HABITAT LOSS PERMIT ORDINANCE</u> – Does the proposed project conform to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings?							
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT				
Discussion: While the proposed project and off-site improvements are located outside of the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program, the project site and locations of any off-site improvements do not contain habitats subject to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance. Therefore, conformance to the Habitat Loss Permit/Coastal Sage Scrub Ordinance findings is not required.							
<u>II. MSCP/BMO</u> - Does the proposed project conform to the Multiple Species Conservation Program and Biological Mitigation Ordinance?							
`	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT				
Discussion:							
The proposed project and any off-site improvements related to the proposed project are located outside of the boundaries of the Multiple Species Conservation Program. Therefore, conformance with the Multiple Species Conservation Program and the Biological Mitigation Ordinance is not required.							
III. GROUNDWATER ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with the requirements of the San Diego County Groundwater Ordinance?							
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT				
Discussion:							

The project will obtain its water supply from the Ramona Municipal Water District which obtains water from surface reservoirs and/or imported sources. The project will not use any groundwater for any purpose, including irrigation or domestic supply.

IV. RESOURCE PROTECTION ORDINANCE - Does the project comply with:

The wetland and wetland buffer regulations (Sections 86.604(a) and (b)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Floodways and Floodplain Fringe section (Sections 86.604(c) and (d)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Steep Slope section (Section 86.604(e))?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Sensitive Habitat Lands section (Section 86.604(f)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
The Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites section (Section 86.604(g)) of the Resource Protection Ordinance?	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT

Discussion:

Wetland and Wetland Buffers:

The site contains no wetland habitats as defined by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance. The site does not have a substratum of predominately undrained hydric soils, the land does not support, even periodically, hydric plants, nor does the site have a substratum that is non-soil and is saturated with water or covered by water at some time during the growing season of each year. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(a) and (b) of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

Floodways and Floodplain Fringe:

The project is not located near any floodway or floodplain fringe area as defined in the resource protection ordinance, nor is it near a watercourse plotted on any official County floodway or floodplain map. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(c) and (d) of the Resource Protection Ordinance.

Steep Slopes:

The average slope for the property is less than 25 percent gradient. Slopes with a gradient of 25 percent or greater and 50 feet or higher in vertical height are required to be placed in open space easements by the San Diego County Resource Protection Ordinance (RPO). There are no steep slopes on the property. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Sections 86.604(e) of the RPO.

Sensitive Habitats:

No sensitive habitat lands were identified on the site as determined on a site visit conducted by Jarrett Ramaiya on February 27, 2009. Therefore, it has been found that the proposed project complies with Section 86.604(f) of the RPO.

Significant Prehistoric and Historic Sites:

County of San Diego staff archaeologist, Gail Wright, has inspected the property, analyzed records, and determined there are no archaeological/ historical sites. The results of the survey are provided in an archaeological survey report (prepared for an earlier project on the same parcel) titled, Cultural Resources Survey Report for: TPM 20792, Log No. 03-09-035 – McDonald Minor Subdivision APN 282-341-17 Negative Findings by Gail Wright, Staff Archaeologist dated January 13, 2004. Therefore, it has

been found that the	ne proposed	i project com	olies with Sections 86.604(g)	of the RPO.
	shed Protec		- Does the project comply winater Management and Discha	
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	
Discussion:				
The project Stori complete and in c		•	Plan has been reviewed an).	d is found to be
			ect comply with the County of e County of San Diego Noise	•
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE	
Discussion:				

The proposal would not expose people to nor generate potentially significant noise levels which exceed the allowable limits of the County of San Diego Noise Element of the General Plan, County of San Diego Noise Ordinance, and other applicable local, State, and Federal noise control regulations.

Transportation (traffic, railroad, aircraft) noise levels at the project site are not expected to exceed Community Noise Equivalent Level (CNEL)=60 decibels (dB) limit because review of the project indicates that the project is not in close proximity to a railroad and/or airport. Additionally, the County of San Diego GIS noise model does not indicate that the project would be subject to potential excessive noise levels from circulation element roads either now or at General Plan buildout.

Noise impacts to the proposed project from adjacent land uses are not expected to exceed the property line sound level limits of the County of San Diego Noise Ordinance.

VII. CALIFORNIA AERONAUTICS ACT – Does the proposed project conform to the Act's provisions?

	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT
two miles of a pu	blic airport c	or public use a	t Influence Area for a public airport, nor within airport where no airport land use plan has ompatible with the California Aeronautics Act.
			ederal Aviation Regulations, Objects Chapter 1, Part 77 – Does the proposed
project conform to	o the Code's	s provisions?	
	YES	NO	NOT APPLICABLE/EXEMPT

The Federal Aviation Administration has conducted an aeronautical study under the provisions of 49 U.S.C., Section 44718 and Title 14 of the Code of Federal Regulations, part 77. This study revealed that the project does not exceed obstruction standards and would not be a hazard to air navigation. Therefore, the project complies with the Federal Aviation Administration Runway Approach Protection Standards (Federal Aviation Regulations, Part 77 – Objects Affecting Navigable Airspace).